UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/771,120	01/26/2001	Stefan Johansson	15292.4	7001

7590   09/07/2006

RICK D. NYDEGGER
WORKMAN NYDEGGER & SEELEY
1000 Eagle Gate Tower
60 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, UT 84145

EXAMINER
MOORE, IAN N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2616	

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		09/771,120	JOHANSSON, STEFAN
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit
		Ian N. Moore	2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>11 August 2006</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-24</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-9,11-21 and 23</u> is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) <u>10 and 22</u> is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6-19-06</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1.   Amended Claims 1 and 13 are objected to because of the following informalities:

   Claim 1 recites, "a message" in line 9 and line 10. It is unclear whether "a message"

recited in <u>line 10</u> is the same message as recited in line 9.

   Claim 13 is also objected for the same reason as set forth above in claim 1.

Appropriate correction is required.

Double Patenting (Provisional)

1.   The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine
grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or
improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible
harassment by multiple assignees.   A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection
is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined
application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined
application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference
claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re
Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225
USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re
Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163
USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).
        A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may
be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting
ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned
with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the
scope of a joint research agreement.
        Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal
disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR
3.73(b).

2.   Claim 1 and 13 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type

double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 13 of copending Application No.

09/771,121 (Johansson). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not

patentably distinct from each other because claims 1 and 13 of the instant application merely

broadens the scope of the claims 1 and 13 of the Johansson by eliminating the elements and their

functions of the claims (i.e. eliminating "…that is included in a set of one or more predefined

network address stored by the wireless mobile communication station, a packet data session,

verifying as authentic") and rewording the identical steps (i.e. "determining if the received

network address matches a predefined network address of the originator" and "verifying the

identify of the originator at the wireless communicating station" as "acquiring at the wireless

mobile communication station an identify corresponding to the received network address").

Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to rename the same functional

components in order to achieve mobile unit's determination/verification of received messages

before establishing connection. Moreover, it has been held that the omission an element and its

function is an obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform the same function as before.

In re Karlson, 136 USPQ 184 (CCPA). Also note *Ex parte Rainu*, 168 USPQ 375

(Bd.App.1969); omission of a reference element whose function is not needed would be obvious

to one skilled in the art.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting

claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4.   Claims 1,2,4-7,11-14,16-19, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by Andersson (US006047194A).

Regarding Claim 1, Andersson discloses a method at a wireless communication station

(see FIG. 1, Mobile terminal 14) for enabling the wireless mobile communication station to

selectively permit desired packet data to be pushed from an originator of packet data (see FIG. 1,

from Internet Host 12) to the wireless mobile communication station, the station being

operatively associated with a wireless communication network providing packet data transferring

services (see col. 3, line 40-47; packet switching network), the method comprising the acts of:

receiving at the wireless mobile communication station a network address of an

originator of packet data that is attempting to push the packet data to the mobile communication

station (see FIG. 2, 114; see FIG. 4, step 168; see col. 5, line 65 to col. 6, line 7; see col. 7, line

40-65; see col. 8, line 45-56; see col. 10, line 57-57; mobile terminal receives an SMS message

with in identifier (i.e. Origination Address (OA) according to GSM's SMS standard) of the

origination source/host that is trying to send packet data),

wherein the network address of the originator is received in a message (see FIG. 1, a

SMS message with OA is received at mobile terminal)) from a message service (see FIG. 1,

Short Message Service-Center (SMS-C) 56 issues an SMS message, (see dash line from SMS-C

56 to mobile 14 in FIG. 1); see col. 7, line 16-64; also see FIG. 4, step 168; see col. 8, line 50-60)

in response to the originator submitting a request to the message service (see FIG. 1, according to

a information/request message from Internet Host 12 is sent to SMS-C 56) that a message be

transmitted to the wireless mobile communication station (see col. 7, line 16-54; to transmit a

SMS message with OA to mobile terminal to receive mobile's permission; (see dash line from

Internet host 12 to SMS-C 56 in FIG. 1); also see FIG. 4, step 164,166; see col. 8, line 45-60);

acquiring at the wireless mobile communication station an identity corresponding to the

received network address (see FIG. 4, step 172; see col. 6, line 4-10; see col. 7, line 60 to col. 8,

line 2, 59-65; see col. 9, line 32-35; see col. 10, line 50-56; detecting/acquiring an identity of the

origination source associating with received identifier/OA);

determining at the wireless mobile communication station, based upon the identity,

whether or not packet data reception from said originator is desired (see FIG. 4, step 174; see col.

6, line 5-14; see col. 8, line 3-14, 59-65; see col. 9, line 35-40; select whether to permit

transmission of packet data responsive to the identity of origination source);

and establishing at the wireless mobile station, only after it is determined that the packet

data reception from said originator is desired, a packet data session with said originator (see FIG.

4, step 176; see col. 6, line 10-14; see col. 8, line 10 to col. 9, line 5, 40-44; after

permitting/accepting packet transmission from origination source, a end-to-end packet

session/connection is established);

thereby enabling the wireless mobile communication station to selectively permit desired

packet data to be pushed from said originator to the wireless communication station (see col. 8,

line 10-14, 60-67; col. 8, line 65 to col. 9, line 6; thereby providing the mobile terminal to select

desired origination source to receive the packet data).

Regarding Claim 13, Andersson discloses a method at a wireless communication station

(see FIG. 1, Mobile terminal 14) for enabling the wireless mobile communication station to

selectively permit desired packet data to be pushed from an originator of packet data (see FIG. 1,

from Internet Host 12) to the wireless mobile communication station, the station being

operatively associated with a wireless communication network providing packet data transferring

services (see col. 3, line 40-47; packet switching network), the method comprising the acts of:

transmitting, to a message service provided by the wireless communication network, (s

see FIG. 1, sending to Short Message Service-Center (SMS-C) 56) from an originator (see FIG.

1, Internet host 12) that is attempting to push the packet data that is attempting to push the packet

data to the mobile communication station, (see col. 7, line 16-54; from the Internet host 12 that

is trying/attempting to push/send the packet data to the mobile terminal), original's own network

address (see col. 7, line 45-53; source IP address) and a request to transmit a message that

includes said network address to the wireless communication station (see FIG. 2, 114; see FIG.

4, step 168; see col. 5, line 65 to col. 6, line 7; see col. 7, line 16-65; see col. 8, line 45-56; see

col. 10, line 57-57, a information/request message to transmit an SMS message with in identifier

(i.e. Origination/source Address (OA) according to GSM's SMS standard) of the origination

source/host to the mobile terminal; also see dash line from Internet host 12 to SMS-C 56 in FIG.

1); also see FIG. 4, step 164,166; see col. 8, line 45-60);

transmitting, to the wireless communication station, from the message service, a message

that includes said network address (see FIG. 1, transmitting to mobile terminal 14 from SMS-C

56 an SMS message with OA, (see dash line from SMS-C 56 to mobile 14 in FIG. 1); see col. 7,

line 55-64; also see FIG. 4, step 168; see col. 8, line 50-60);

acquiring at the wireless mobile communication station an identity corresponding to the

received network address (see FIG. 4, step 172; see col. 6, line 4-10; see col. 7, line 60 to col. 8,

line 2, 59-65; see col. 9, line 32-35; see col. 10, line 50-56; detecting/acquiring an identity of the

origination source associating with received identifier/OA);

determining at the wireless mobile communication station, based upon the identity,

whether or not packet data reception from said originator is desired (see FIG. 4, step 174; see col.

6, line 5-14; see col. 8, line 3-14, 59-65; see col. 9, line 35-40; select whether to permit

transmission of packet data responsive to the identity of origination source);

and establishing from the wireless mobile station, only after it is determined that the

packet data reception from said originator is desired, a packet data session with said originator

(see FIG. 4, step 176; see col. 6, line 10-14; see col. 8, line 10 to col. 9, line 5, 40-44; after

mobile terminal permitting/accepting packet transmission from origination source, end-to-end

packet session/connection is established/connected);

thereby enabling the wireless mobile communication station to selectively permit desired

packet data to be pushed from said originator to the wireless communication station (see col. 8,

line 10-14, 60-67; col. 8, line 65 to col. 9, line 6; thereby providing the mobile terminal to select

desired origination source to receive the packet data).

Regarding Claim 2 and 14, Andersson discloses displaying said identity on displaying

means (see FIG. 3, Display 144) associated with the wireless communication station (see col. 8,

line 32-35); and

accepting, from a user of the wireless station, either a confirmation or a rejection

regarding reception of packet data from said originator having the displayed identity (see col. 8,

line 44; user of mobile terminal performs the selection to grant).

Regarding Claim 4 and 16, Andersson discloses wherein said network address of said

receiving act is received in a short message (see col. 6, line 1-10; SMS), the short message being

received from a short message service provided by said wireless communication network (see

FIG. 1, Short Message service-center, SMS-C 56; see col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 10).

Regarding Claim 5 and 17, Andersson discloses establishing a packet data session using

said identity (see col. 5, line 65 to col. 6, line 14; see col. 7, line 40-65; see col. 8, line 10-14,45-

67; see col. 9, line 40-44; see col. 10, line 57-57).

Regarding Claim 6 and 18, Andersson discloses wherein said network address is an

Internet Protocol address (see col. 7, line 40-35; IP address).

Regarding Claim 7 and 19, Andersson discloses establishing a packet data session using

said identity (see FIG. 4, step 176; see col. 6, line 10-14; see col. 8, line 10-14, 60-67; see col. 9,

line 40-44; establishing packet transmission using identify of origination source).

Regarding Claim 11, Andersson discloses a computer-readable medium storing

computer-executable components for causing a wireless communication station to perform the

acts recited in claim 1 when the computer-executable components are run on microprocessor

included by a wireless communication station (see FIG. 3, mobile terminal 14 contains processor

and memory; see col. 8, line 14-32).

Regarding Claim 12 and 23, Andersson discloses a wireless communication station (see

FIG. 3, mobile terminal 14) arranged to be operatively associated with a wireless communication

network (see FIG. 1, mobile network) providing packet data transferring services, wherein the

wireless communication station includes processing means (see FIG. 3, mobile terminal 14

contains processor), memory means (see FIG. 3, mobile terminal 14 contains memory), interface

circuitry means (see FIG. 3, Rx circuitry 142 with radio antenna interface) and user interface

means (see FIG. 3, Display 144 and selector 146) for performing the acts recited in claim 1 (see

col. 8, line 14-32), thereby facilitating desired packet data to be pushed from an originator to the

wireless communication station (see col. 15, line 16-42; thereby providing the subscriber to

select desired/preferred packet data system provider to receive the packet data).

Regarding Claim 24, Andersson discloses wherein the originator (see FIG. 1, Internet

host 12) communicates with the message service (see FIG. 1, SMS-C 56) over a packet data

network (see FIG. 1, Internet backbone 22); see col. 5, line 6-15.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 3 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Andersson in view of Wang (US006614774B1).

Regarding Claim 3 and 15, Andersson discloses establishing a packet data session as set

forth above in claim 1 and 13. Andersson does not explicitly disclose an address translation

server; and requesting translation of the network address to the corresponding identity. However,

Wang teaches establishing a packet data session (see FIG. 4, reverse DNS request/lookup) with

an address translation server (see FIG. 4, DNS server 118); and

requesting translation of the network address (see FIG. 4, IP address) to the

corresponding identity (see FIG. 4, host name; see col. 8, line 32-47). Therefore, it would have

been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide

DNS server and reverse DNS lookups, as taught by Wang in the system of Andersson, so that it

would avoid DNS lookup failures and does not introduce delays and cost effective system; see

Wang col. 5, line 50-60.

7.   Claims 8,9, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Andersson in view of Brothers (US006822955B1).

Regarding Claim 8,9,20 and 21, Andersson discloses said identity is the originator

name as set forth above claims 1 and 13, and a network server (see FIG. 1, SMS-C, VPMSC 44,

or GPMSC 46). Andersson does not explicitly disclose wherein said identity is an Internet

domain host name of a network server. However, Brothers teaches wherein said identity is an

Internet domain host name of a network server (see FIG. 13, a server Internet domain host name,

"Disney.com"). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at

the time the invention was made to provide an Internet domain host name as an identify, as

taught by Brothers in the system of Andersson, so that it would provide full transparent IP

mobility services for clients; see Brothers col. 1, line 60 to col. 2, line 5.

Allowable Subject Matter

8.   **Claims 10 and 22** are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but

would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base

claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

9.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-9,11-21,23, and 24 have been considered

but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Regarding claims 1 and 13 for rejection based on double patenting, the applicant

argued that, "...the '121 application was filed on the same day as the present application...the

'121 application is not eligible for use in connection with an obviousness-type double patenting

rejection inasmuch as they were filed on the same day..." in page 9, paragraph II.

In response to applicant's argument, the examiner respectfully disagrees that with

argument above.

First, applicant appears to be mistaken the "nonstatutory double patenting" rejection with

<u>as</u> prior art rejection (i.e. USC 102,103). Double patenting is recited as follows:

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine
grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or
improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible
harassment by multiple assignees.   A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection
is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined
application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined
application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference
claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re
Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225
USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re
Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163
USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

Second, as set forth above, there is <u>no filing date eligibility or analysis required</u> in

nonstatutory double patenting. Double patenting clearly based on a judicially created doctrine

grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or

improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible

harassment by multiple assignees.

As <u>admitted by the applicant</u> that "...*'121 application was filed on the same day as the*

present application...", and thus it is clear that the same scope of claimed invention is filed on

the same day in two applications by the applicant.

Regarding claims 1-9,11-21,23, and 24, the applicant argued that, "...

(1) Andersson fails to teach or suggest...a wireless communication station which

establishes a packet data session with an originator of packet data using a received network

address of the originator or using an identity corresponding to the received network address ...

establishing at [or from] the wireless mobile communication station, only after it is determined

that the packet data reception from said originator is desired, a packet data session with said

originator...

(2) Instead, Andersson discloses that a mobile terminal 14 initiates registration to enter

into a packet into a packet state pursuant to packet communication registration procedures, after

which packet data, which has already been routed from an Internet host 12 to a GPMC 46 and

then forward to a VPMSC 44, is forwarded from VPMSC 44 and routed to the mobile terminal

14..." in page 11, paragraph III b; page 13, paragraph IV.

In response to applicant's argument, the examiner respectfully disagrees that with

argument above.

(1) Andersson discloses establishing at the wireless mobile station, only after it is

determined that the packet data reception from said originator is desired, a packet data session

with said originator (**see FIG. 4, step 176; see col. 6, line 10-14; see col. 8, line 10 to col. 9, line**

5, 40-44; after permitting/accepting packet transmission from origination source, an end-

to-end packet session/connection is established/connected).

(2) Applicant is mistakenly arguing the registration or set up procedures routed between

Internet host 12 and various MSCs (i.e. VPMSC and GPMSC) as "end-to-end packet data

session". In reality, establishing an end-to-end packet data session occurs only after the user of

mobile terminal 14 is desired or accepted to receive packet data from the Internet host as

described in below by Andersson.

When the SMS message indicating the originator of the packet data is received at the
receiver circuitry 142, such identification is displayed upon the display element 144. A user of
the mobile terminal determines, responsive to the displayed information, whether to permit
transmission of the packet data to the mobile terminal 14. Selection of permission to receive the
packet data is entered by way of the selector 146. **When permission is granted to transmit the**
packet data to the mobile terminal 14, the mobile terminal 14 registers to receive packet
data. Thereafter, the packet data is routed to the mobile terminal. (see Andersson col. 8,
line 33-44)
     Then, and as indicated by the block 166, the identity of the sending station from which
the packet data originates is determined. **An SMS message is formed which indicates the**
identity of the sending station. The SMS message is sent, as indicated by the block 168, to the
mobile receiving station.
     The SMS message is detected at the mobile receiving station, as indicated by the block
172. **Selection is then made, as indicated by the block 174, whether to accept transmission**
of the packet data originated by the sending station. And, the packet data is sent to the
mobile receiving station, indicated by the block 176, if the transmission is accepted at the
mobile receiving station.
     Thereby, packet data is transmitted to the mobile terminal only with the permission of
the mobile terminal. **Transmission of undesired, or otherwise unsolicited, packet data is**
selectably prevented at the mobile terminal by denying permission to transmit the packet

data thereto. The user of the mobile terminal is able to control, thereby, which packets of data are transmitted to the mobile terminal. (see Andersson col. 8, line 55 to col. 9, line 5). (Emphasis added)

In view of the above, it is clear that an end-to-end packet data transmission between the mobile terminal and the sending station or originator host is established <u>only after</u> the mobile station is accepted the transmission.

Conclusion

10.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ian N. Moore whose telephone number is 571-272-3085. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM- 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Doris To can be reached on 571-272-7629. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

INM
8-18-06

DORIS H. TO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600